```
1
      APPEARANCES:
           OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
 2
           By: Gregg D. Shapiro, Esq.
 3
           One Courthouse Way
           Boston, Massachusetts 02210
           On behalf of the United States.
 4
 5
           Suzanne E. Durrell, Esq.
           180 Williams Avenue
 6
           Milton, Massachusetts 02186
           On behalf of Christopher R. Gobble.
 7
           SUGARMAN, ROGERS, BARSHAK & COHEN, P.C.
           By: William F. Benson, Esq.
 8
           101 Merrimac Street
           Boston, Massachusetts 02114-4737
 9
           - and -
10
           DeBEVOISE & PLIMPTON
           By: Christopher K. Tahbaz, Esq.,
                Kristin Kiehn, Esq.,
11
                Bryan P. Kessler, Esq., and
                Edwin G. Schallert, Esq.
12
           919 Third Avenue
13
           New York, New York 10022-3902
           On behalf of Forest Laboratories, Inc.
14
           BOISES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP
           By: Robert A. Magnanini, Esq.
15
           150 John F. Kennedy Parkway
           Short Hills, New Jersey 07078
16
           On behalf of Joseph Piacentile.
17
           MURRAY LAW FIRM
           By: James R. Dugan, Esq.
18
           650 Poydras Street
19
           Suite 2150
           New Orleans, Louisiana 70130.
           On behalf of New Mexico UFCW Union's and Employer's
20
           Health and Welfare Trust Fund and Allied Services Division
21
           Welfare Fund.
22
           PENDLEY, BAUDIN & COFFIN, LLP
           By: Christopher Coffin, Esq.
           24110 Eaden Street
23
           P.O. Box 71
24
           Plaquemine, Louisiana 70765
           On behalf of Anna Murret, Jayne Ehrlich, Martha Palumbo
25
           and Peter Palumbo.
```

1 PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: This is MDL-2067, In Re: Celexa and 2 3 Lexapro Marketing and Sales Practice Litigation; and Forest Labs Matter 05-10201 and 03-10395. Counsel please identify 4 5 themselves for the record. 6 MR. SOBOL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Thomas Sobol, 7 Hagens, Berman, Sobol, Shapiro, one of the members of the proposed plaintiffs' steering committee. 8 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Sobol. 10 MR. SOBOL: Good afternoon, your Honor. 11 MS. BARNES: Good afternoon, your Honor. Lauren 12 Barnes, Hagens, Berman, Sobol, Shapiro. 13 THE COURT: Miss Barnes. 14 MR. HORTON: Good afternoon, your Honor. J.D. Horton, 15 of Korein Tillery, for the plaintiffs. THE COURT: For the -- for which plaintiff? 16 MR. HORTON: Plaintiff Universal Care, Inc. 17 18 THE COURT: Universal. 19 MR. HORTON: That's correct. 20 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Horton. 21 MR. DUGAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. James Dugan 22 with the Murray Law Firm out of New Orleans, Louisiana, on

MR. DUGAN: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Dugan, good afternoon.

behalf of the New Mexico Fund.

23

24

1 MR. SWEDLOW: Good afternoon. Stephen Swedlow from Korein Tillery, on behalf of Fullmer and Jaeckel and Universal 2 3 Care, cocounsel with J.D. Horton on that filed case. THE COURT: So that's on the Universal case, right? 4 5 MR. SWEDLOW: Yes. 6 MR. COFFIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Chris Coffin with Pendley, Baudin & Coffin, plaintiffs' counsel on the 7 Palumbo case and also one of the proposed steering committee 8 members. 9 10 THE COURT: Mr. Coffin, good afternoon. 11 MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, Gregg Shapiro for the United 12 States in the two Qui Tam matters. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. DURRELL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Suzanne 15 Durrell representing Mr. Gobble in the '03 Qui Tam matter. 16 MR. MAGNANINI: Good afternoon, your Honor. Paul 17 Magnanini, from Stone & Magnanini, for Relator Doctor Joseph Piacentilli in the '05 Qui Tam matter. 18 19 THE COURT: Mr. Magnanini, good afternoon to you. MR. TAHBAZ: Good afternoon, your Honor. Christopher 20 21 Tahbaz, Debevoise & Plimpton, for Forest Laboratories and 22 Forest Pharmaceuticals. 23 MS. KIEHN: Kristin Kiehn, from Debevoise & Plimpton, 24 for Forest. 25 THE COURT: Miss Kiehn.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHALLERT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Schallert on behalf of the defendants in the MDL proceeding. THE COURT: In the MDL proceeding. Okay. MR. KESSLER: Bryan Kessler, Debevoise, on behalf of the defendants in the MDL. MR. BENSON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Bill Benson, from Sugarman, Rogers, Barshak and Cohen, for the defendants. THE COURT: Good afternoon to all, counsel. We are here, actually, on two separate matters. And I would like, actually, to start with a report from those involved in the Qui Tam cases as to the status. As I am aware, we had originally scheduled a status conference for after the 90-day period, which is due to expire on November 30th. But because of this matter, this case management conference, in cases that may or may not be related, I thought that it would be appropriate to hear what the status now is of the progress towards settlement of the Qui Tam cases. MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, your Honor. Just a point of clarification, I think the 90-day order was issued on September 29th, which puts its expiration at the end of the --THE COURT: I thought it was September 1st, but I could be wrong. Maybe I'm a month in advance. MR. SHAPIRO: In another case I have, the Court did a 60-day order, but in this one it was a 90-day order, and I

think it expires near the end of the year.

For clarification purposes, it would help us to know, was -- are the deadlines that were previously set now off pending a motion --

THE COURT: No, I did not mean to shorten the deadlines. I just wanted to have an interim status report of what is going on in the Qui Tam cases.

MR. SHAPIRO: We have been negotiating with Forest.

It's a complex negotiation that does not just involve the

Department of Justice. And with respect to the Department of

Justice, I believe that we are very close to done. However,

our agreement is contingent on other pieces falling into place,

and the Department doesn't have direct control over those

pieces. And so I think perhaps Forest can speak better to

those.

We are optimistic that we can -- from our perspective, we're about done. Based on what I understand from Forest, I'm optimistic that this can be completed in the next several weeks. But perhaps Mr. Tahbaz can speak more to that.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Tahbaz.

MR. TAHBAZ: Thank you, your Honor. I would agree with Mr. Shapiro. We have been working diligently towards completing the documentation of the settlement. We've made substantial progress towards a federal settlement agreement, agreement with the Department of Justice. We've exchanged drafts. We are nearing the completion, I think, of that

document.

Another one of the pieces is negotiating a model settlement agreement with the National Association of Medicare Fraud Units. We are on our way to doing that. Again, we have exchanged drafts. We're probably a little farther behind, but I think we are getting there.

The third piece of this is negotiating a Corporate

Integrity Agreement with OIG and Health and Human Services.

That process has taken a little bit longer than we anticipated, and OIG has still -- is still not ready to finalize that document. Some issues have come up which we are trying to work with.

All of those pieces need to be resolved before we can put this settlement to bed. I am confident that we will get through the federal, the DOJ, and the state pieces of this within the next few weeks. The OIG, I am less certain, although we are speaking and working diligently, and I hope to be there.

THE COURT: When we last met, I understood that the potential stumbling block was the settlement with the states' Attorneys General. But now that's not the case?

MR. TAHBAZ: We don't believe at this time that the piece with the states is the stumbling block, and I'd have to go back and look at what exactly what we said. I don't think we meant to convey last time that was a stumbling block, rather

that that was --

THE COURT: I maybe misspeak to say the "stumbling block," but that that was something that needed to be resolved before the ultimate resolution.

MR. TAHBAZ: Yes. And that is in progress, and we think we're making good progress there. As I said, the OIG piece is lagging a little bit behind. I don't think because of anyone's fault or dilatory actions. It's a very complicated document. There are some other issues that go beyond the parties' immediate settlement negotiations and need to be addressed.

THE COURT: Without committing you to an absolute date, what is your best estimate for the ultimate settlement of these so-called Oui Tam cases?

MR. TAHBAZ: It is, quite frankly, a little hard to say because of OIG. Where I believe we are is that we will be done with the federal, with the DOJ, and the state piece sometime before Christmas. Those are both contingent, ultimately, on coming to some sort of an agreement with OIG. I think, before Christmas, we will know whether -- we will have a good sense of whether that agreement is either -- obviously, if it's finished, we'll know where it is. If it's not finished, we'll know exactly where it's going by then.

THE COURT: Is it your understanding that Mr. Shapiro is correct and that the deadline was the end of the year and

not December 1st?

MR. TAHBAZ: My understanding was that we had agreed in court on a deadline of the end -- at the end of November. We had set a status conference, I believe, for December 3rd. That's what we have in our calendars. And then we saw your Honor's settlement order of dismissal which appeared to move that deadline back to the end of December.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then I think that informs everybody present of the status of that case, and I think that, therefore, the plaintiffs' assistant United States attorney and those representatives of the plaintiffs in the Qui Tam case may be excused from the remainder unless they wish to address the Court. Yes, Mr. Tahbaz.

MR. TAHBAZ: I would suggest, just for the sake of good order, if we -- and so that nobody is wondering what's happening the week before the holidays, and perhaps we can schedule a time to come in and meet with your Honor sometime shortly before the holidays just to update your Honor on the status of the settlement.

THE COURT: You mean mid-December?

MR. TAHBAZ: Mid-December, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Let's try to find a date for you that's mutually convenient. Wednesday, the 16th, at 2 p.m., is that a good time?

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm sorry, your Honor. Earlier that

1 week would work for me but not Wednesday through Friday. THE COURT: What about the following week, closer to 2 3 the holiday? MR. SHAPIRO: Hopefully, we can present you with a 4 5 signed document. Any day that week except for the holiday 6 itself is fine with me. 7 MR. MAGNANINI: That's fine with me, too, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Why don't we go to Monday, the 21st. problem with that? Mr. Tahbaz? 9 10 MR. TAHBAZ: Your Honor, that's fine with me. 11 THE COURT: Monday -- let's get a time. Why don't we 12 say 11 a.m. on Monday, December 21st, for a further status 13 conference on the Qui Tam cases. All right. 14 Did you want to address the Court, Miss Durrell? MS. DURRELL: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. I just 15 wanted to clarify one thing for the Court. Our Qui Tam case 16 also has within it a personal claim against Defendant Forest 17 18 for, we allege, unlawfully retaliating against Mr. Gobble and 19 his employment.

And at this point in time, it appears we're not able to resolve that matter, and so that matter is going to need to go forward either to some sort of mediation, would be a possibility, or, otherwise, we're going to have to go forward and litigate it with discovery and whatnot.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just wanted to bring that to the Court's attention,

especially in light of the Court's dismissal order, which I think expires at the end of December. So perhaps we could address this at the next conference, but I at least wanted to alert your Honor to that fact.

THE COURT: It would be helpful, Miss Durrell, if you would submit something in writing before that hearing as to what you propose; and, obviously, if you can join in that filing with Forest, that would be helpful. If it -- we would be glad to help you convene mediation, or if there's to be limited discovery on the retaliation claim and we have to get it ready for trial, we'll do that.

I think I'd like some guidance from you, hopefully, with the concurrence of the defendant, as to how we should proceed.

MS. DURRELL: That's fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: On or before. Why don't we say, if you get me that a week before our hearing, by December 14th, that would be helpful.

MS. DURRELL: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else in that case that needs to be heard? If not, then those counsel are excused.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. DURRELL: Thank you.

MR. MAGNANINI: Thank you, your Honor.

25 . . END OF EXCERPT.)